



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/540,392

06/23/2005

Beier Markus

2923-714

2991

6449

7590

12/09/2009

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

1425 K STREET, N.W.

SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

WESSENDORF, TERESA D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1639

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/09/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/540,392	Applicant(s) MARKUS, BEIER	
	Examiner TERESA WESSENDORF	Art Unit 1639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19 and 22-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1639

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 18-23 and 25-38 are pending.

Claims 20 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species.

Claims 18-19, 22-23 and 25-38 are under examination.

Withdrawn Rejections

In view of the amendments to the claims and applicant's arguments the 35 USC 102 rejection over Schuetz is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Written Description Rejection

Claims 18-19, 22-23 and 25-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a

Art Unit: 1639

way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 18 recites a method for producing a carrier for the determination of analytes, comprising: (a) providing a microfluidic carrier, (b) passing liquid with biopolymer receptor building blocks for synthesizing biopolymeric receptors over predetermined zones on the carrier, (c) immobilizing the biopolymer receptor building blocks in said predetermined zones on the carrier and (d) repeating steps (b) and (c) until the desired biopolymeric receptors have been synthesized in -situ in the predetermined zones on the carrier using the immobilized biopolymer receptor building blocks from step (c), wherein hapten groups are applied to the carrier before, during or/and after the synthesis of the biopolymeric receptors.

The specification fails to describe the situ-synthesis of any kind of biopolymer receptor utilizing any building blocks immobilized by any liquid to any given microfluidic carrier such that a carrier is produced for the determination of analytes. The claim generic method of synthesizing a biopolymer comprises numerous possible biomolecules comprising of numerous receptor building blocks. It is not apparent from the claim generic method whether the liquid containing building blocks to

Art Unit: 1639

synthesize the receptors into the carrier are of the same or of different kind(s) of biomolecules and/or of the same or different length. The genus claim method provides no characterizing or distinguishing features of one compound/components use in the method. The claim covers numerous undefined components used in the method. It is also not apparent from the specification which carrier has predetermined zones such that only a particular kind of building blocks can attach thereto. The specification lacks adequate written description that would lead a skilled artisan to the genus claim. The specification at e.g., page 5, lines 13-25 provides no more than general statements and/or lists of the building blocks such as the monomers of mononucleotides, amino acids etc., and oligomeric building blocks e.g., di, tri or tetranucleotides or peptides. The specification further discloses that the receptors can be selected from the lists of nucleic acids such as DNA, RNA, nucleic acid analogs such as peptide nucleic acids (PNA), proteins, peptides and carbohydrates. To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the **genus**. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics,

Art Unit: 1639

structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. A listing or definition of every possible surface or target does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus. It would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species. In re Ruschig, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967). Furthermore, there is not a single working example to show that applicants are in possession of a single species of the carrier made, let alone, a genus carrier produced by the claim method. The drawing figures discloses in general terms, not in detail, a method using a specific hapten containing phosphoramidites building block with a diisopropylamino groups and ethoxy derivative. However, it is not readily apparent from the figures the biopolymer receptor that has been produced by the method and more importantly that is used for the determination of any type of analytes. It is well known in the art that the selection of the right hapten structures is very important to build up an array successfully. Abad et al (J. Agri.Food Chem.) at e.g., page 1486, paragraph bridging col. 1 up to col. 3 states that the critical role generally attributed to immunoassays depends on the fact that the properties of the antibodies are primarily determined by the hapten structure. A strategy that has been sometime successfully included in the

Art Unit: 1639

coating antibody by hapten to improve sensitivity is irrelevant in other cases. Thus, one may not preempt an unduly large field by the expedient of making broad prophetic statements in the specification and claim unless the accuracy of such statements is sufficiently supported by well-established chemical principles or by sufficient number of examples.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18-19, 22-23 and 25-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Claim 18 is vague and indefinite as to the synthesis of the building blocks of the receptor i.e., the metes and bounds of the building receptors. It is vague and indefinite whether the building blocks are of the same kind and/or of the same length. It is further vague and indefinite as to how each completely different building block(s) occupied a predetermined zone in the carrier. Claim 18 therefore seems to omit essential

Art Unit: 1639

elements and/or steps to distinguish e.g., dissimilar building blocks to occupy a zone predetermined for a particular block.

2. Claim 18 is vague and indefinite as to the metes and bounds of the liquid containing building blocks and delivery of said liquid for a particular immobilized block. It is not clear whether the same liquid would be used for any or all kinds of building blocks. It is further vague and indefinite whether each pass of the liquid the building block is immobilized to the already passed block or to another predetermined zone of the carrier. There seems to be some missing element/step or correspondence amongst the steps.

3. Claim 19 is unclear as to the time specific immobilization i.e., the conditions considered to be appropriate/specific for immobilization.

4. Claim 23 is unclear as to the recitation of closed channels of a carrier. The term "closed" is a relative term the basis or standard by which it is considered close especially in the in-situ synthesis is unclear. The specification does not define said term especially as applied to the general term "microfluidic" carrier.

5. Claims 28 and 29 are vague and indefinite if the at least 50 or 100 different polymer receptor zones indicate that are 50 or 100 different biopolymer(s) in the receptor zones.

6. The term "high", "specific" in claim 30", "adjacent" in claim 32;"selectively" in claim 33; "disposed" in claim 35 are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. These terms not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Because there are no distinguishing or characterizing features for any of the components use in the method hence each of the terms above are vague and indefinite as to the basis or standard by which the terms are employed. The definition provided in the specification at e.g., page 7, first incomplete paragraph does not point out the terms with particularity. The term "high-affinity interaction" means in this connection that the interaction between hapten group and binding partner is **sufficiently strong** to enable the incorporation of hapten groups on the carrier to be controlled under particular operating conditions with an appropriate detection reagent. (Emphasis added.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 1639

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 18, 19, 22-23, 25-27 and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bamdad (USP 7615340).

For claims 18, 19, 22-23, 25-27 and 30-38, Bamdad discloses e.g., the abstract a method of synthesis of members positioned partially or fully in channels in microfluidic systems. The porous members can be assembled and/or disassembled in situ. The porous members can be made such that pores are separated by connections including but a single molecule at one location, allowing for a high level of open area in a very small pore size member. The members can be used to detect analytes qualitatively and/or quantitatively, or to selectively bind and/or release

agents on command for a variety of purposes including first blocking, then opening a channel, concentrating analyte over time followed by release of analyte and detection downstream. Porous members can define valves in multiple-channel systems and, with controlled binding and release of agents at the porous members, these valves can be opened and closed⁹ reads on claim 23) and fluid flow controlled in a multi-channel system. Fluidic systems of the invention can include multiple sensing locations at which different analytes are determined. Systems of the invention provide flexibility for overall microchemical analysis, sequentially, of a variety of agents. Bamdad discloses at e.g., col. 2, lines 44-55, the porous members as preferably biopolymers **that** are assembled in situ within the flow channel so that they become an integral part of the channel. Nanostructures that incorporate particles and biopolymers but do not include ligands that bind a target species are preferred for use as chip-scale filters, such filters can also be disassembled and reconfigured in situ, across interior cross-sections of flow channels. The nano-filters can be anchored to derivatized flow channels via biospecific interactions, such as DNA hybridization and/or biotin-streptavidin binding(hapten, as recited in claim

Art Unit: 1639

31). Bamdad discloses at e.g., col. 4, line 43 up to col. 5, line 41 a method that involves passing a fluid through a porous member and allowing a chemical, biological, or biochemical agent within the fluid to bind to a binding partner of the agent immobilized relative to the porous member.

For claims 28 and 29, Bamdad discloses that the channel can have a cross-sectional dimension of less than about 1000 microns, or less than about 500, 300, 100, or 50 microns in other embodiments.

For claim 32-36, Bamdad discloses a porous member spans a channel, it can span a portion of the channel or can completely span the channel. Where the porous member partially spans the channel, some fluid flowing through the channel will flow through the porous member but other fluid can pass by the porous member and not flow through it.

Where the porous member completely spans the channel, any fluid flowing within the channel must pass through the porous member, i.e., the fluid cannot bypass the porous member within the channel.

For claims 30 and 31, Bamdad discloses at e.g., FIGS. 5A and 5B are before and after schematic illustrations illustrating how nanoparticles bearing antibodies and

Art Unit: 1639

biotin interact with streptavidin and biotinylated dsDNA to form nanostructures that are biospecific.

For claim 31, Bamdad discloses at e.g., col. 8, lines 61-64, affinity tags include streptavidin (in biotin/streptavidin binding). At various locations herein specific affinity tags are described in connection with binding interactions with complementary recognition entity pairs. It is to be understood that the invention involves, in any embodiment employing an affinity tag, a series of individual embodiments each involving selection of any of the affinity tags described herein. Bamdad at col. 17, lines 28-49 discloses the three-dimensional structures constructed of particles and connecting polymers can be constructed across flow channels using a variety of alternative methods to that described above. For example, as illustrated in FIGS. 5A and 5B (which illustrate the various components comprising the nanostructure before (FIG. 5A) and after (FIG. 5B) the self-assembly of the interconnected structure) nanoparticle-DNA nanostructures 310 can also be self-assembled by mixing nanoparticles 312, bearing biotin 314, with streptavidin 316 and DNA 318 that has been modified at or near its ends with biotin. This type of nanostructure can readily be attached to flow

Art Unit: 1639

channels bearing streptavidin at its surface. See the details of the method in the Examples.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 18-19, 22-23 and 25-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamdad in view of Buzby (USP 7220549).

Art Unit: 1639

Bamdad is discussed above. Bamdad does not teach the other hapten such as dinitrophenol. However, Buzby discloses in e.g., col. 2, lines 36-50 primer/target is stabilized on the surface by binding of both the primer and the template to the surface. Binding pairs for use in the invention are any molecular pair that can be bound to a surface and attached to a nucleic acid. Some examples of preferred pairs include biotin/streptavidin, digoxigenin/anti-digoxigenin, and dinitrophenol/anti-dinitrophenol perform well. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use other known hapten groups in the method of Bamdad. One would have a reasonably expectation of success in using other hapten since Buzby teaches the functional equivalence of said hapten groups useful for stabilizing molecular pairs bound on a surface.

Claims 18-19, 22-23 and 25-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of (WO 0013018)(I) or (WO 0289971)(II) or (WO 02/32567)(III) in view of anyone of Wu et al (7034134) or Gray et al (6555310) or Edwards (6455280) for reasons of record as repeated below.

For claims 18, 19, 22-23, 25-27 and 30-38, Stahler et al (I) discloses throughout the entire document at e.g., page 2 and the claims a method for producing a carrier for the

Art Unit: 1639

determination of analytes, comprising: (a) providing a microfluidic carrier, (b) passing liquid with receptor building blocks for synthesizing polymeric receptors over predetermined zones on the carrier, (c) immobilizing the receptor building blocks in said predetermined zones on the carrier and (d) repeating steps (b) and (c) until the desired receptors have been synthesized in the predetermined zones using the receptor building blocks. (U.S. No.7097974 is the national stage entry of WO 0013018, as stated in the Remarks submitted on 6/10/2008.)

See the abstract of each of the Stahler (II) and (III) references. (Please note applicants' remarks made on 6/10/2008, with regards to the corresponding US applications of these two WO Patents).

None of the Stahler references teaches a hapten attached to the carrier. However, Wu discloses throughout the patent at e.g., col. 127, lines 23-27 polypeptides that could be chemically derivatized to attach hapten molecules (e.g., DNP). Wu teaches that due to the availability of monoclonal antibodies specific to such haptens, the protein could be readily purified using immunoprecipitation or can be used for other purposes such as for purification via affinity chromatography, functional and/or structural characterization of protein.

Art Unit: 1639

Gray et al discloses throughout the patent at e.g., col. 13, line 10 up to col. 14, line 56 a method by comprising contacting library (analyte as claimed) with the receptor immobilized to a solid phase and binding of library members through their tag to the receptor is allowed to reach equilibrium. The complexed receptor and library members are then brought out of solution by addition of a solid phase to which the receptor bears affinity (e.g., an avidin-labelled solid phase can be used to immobilize biotin-labelled receptors). Alternatively, the library can be contacted with receptor in solution and the receptor subsequently immobilized. The concentration of receptor should usually be at or above the K_d of the tag/receptor during solution phase binding so that most displayed tags bind to a receptor at equilibrium. When the receptor-library members are contacted with the solid phase only the library members linked to receptor through at least two displayed tags remain bound to the solid phase following separation of the solid phase from library members in solution. Library members linked to receptor through a single tag are presumably sheared from the solid phase during separation and washing of the solid phase. After removal of unbound library members, bound library members can be dissociated from the receptor and solid phase by a change in ionic strength or pH, or addition of a substance that competes with the tag for binding to the receptor. For example, binding of metal chelate ligands immobilized on agarose and containing Ni^{2+} to a hexahistidine sequence is easily reversed by adding imidazole to the solution to compete for binding of the metal chelate ligand. Antibody-peptide binding can often be dissociated by raising the pH to 10.5 or higher.

Edwards discloses throughout the patent at e.g., col. 79, line 59 up to col. 80, line 40:

Microsequencing may be achieved by the established microsequencing method or by developments or derivatives thereof. Alternative methods include several solid-phase microsequencing techniques. The basic microsequencing protocol...[method] is conducted as a heterogeneous phase assay, in which the primer or the target molecule is immobilized or captured onto a solid support. To simplify

Art Unit: 1639

the primer separation and the terminal nucleotide addition analysis, oligonucleotides are attached to solid supports or are modified in such ways that permit affinity separation as well as polymerase extension. The 5' ends and internal nucleotides of synthetic oligonucleotides can be modified in a number of different ways to permit different affinity separation approaches, e.g., biotinylation. If a single affinity group is used on the oligonucleotides, the oligonucleotides can be separated from the incorporated terminator reagent. This eliminates the need of physical or size separation. More than one oligonucleotide can be separated from the terminator reagent and analyzed simultaneously if more than one affinity group is used. This permits the analysis of several nucleic acid species or more nucleic acid sequence information per extension reaction. The affinity group need not be on the priming oligonucleotide but could alternatively be present on the template. For example, immobilization can be carried out via an interaction between biotinylated DNA and streptavidin-**coated** microtitration wells or avidin-coated polystyrene particles. In the same manner, oligonucleotides or templates may be attached to a solid support in a high-density format....Other possible reporter-detection pairs include: ddNTP linked to dinitrophenyl (DNP) and anti-DNP alkaline phosphatase conjugate.. or biotinylated ddNTP and horseradish peroxidase-conjugated streptavidin with o-phenylenediamine as a substrate

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use hapten such as biotin or dinitrophenol in the method of anyone of Stahler et al as taught by Wu or Edwards or Gray. Each of Wu, Edwards and Gray teaches the conventionality of using various haptens that binds to different receptors such as nucleic acid or protein. One would have a reasonable expectation of success in using

said hapten as successfully achieved by Edwards or Wu or Gray in purifying various compounds.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the haptens are solely used for the purification of receptors. This use of haptens is therefore completely different from the use in the method according to the present invention.

In reply, the claims do not recite for any use of hapten except that the hapten groups are applied to the carrier before, during or/and after the synthesis of biopolymer receptors.

Applicants also point out that none of the cited references suggest or disclose the advantages of using haptens in the production of biopolymeric receptor-loaded carriers and thus one skilled in the art would not be motivated to use haptens and receptors together as in the present invention.

In response, as stated above none of the claims recite any use or advantage for the hapten except that it is applied to the carrier.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy

Art Unit: 1639

reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 18-19, 22-23 and 25-38 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, for example, of U.S. Patent No. 7097974('974) in view of anyone of Bamdad or Buzby above.

The claim method in the '974 patent differs from the instant claim method in that the '974 does not contain hapten groups in the synthesis of biopolymers. However, Bamdad or Buzby as discussed above teaches the conventionality of attaching in the carrier hapten groups for e.g., stabilizing the biopolymers

Art Unit: 1639

on the carrier, for example. see further the 103 rejections above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Parce (7091048) discloses a high throughput screening assay systems in microscale fluidic devices

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TERESA WESSENDORF whose telephone number is (571)272-0812. The examiner can normally be reached on flexitime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TERESA WESSENDORF/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1639

Application/Control Number: 10/540,392

Page 21

Art Unit: 1639